

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 17-24, 26-28, and 33-34 are pending in the present application. Claims 9, 13-16, 25, 29-32 and 35 were canceled; claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 17-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 33-34 were amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11-14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 27-30, and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,301,708 issued to *Gazdik et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action dated February 23, 2005, the Examiner stated that claims 9 and 25 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, the features in claim 9 have been incorporated into independent base claim 1. In addition, the features of claim 25 have been incorporated into independent base claim 17. Consequently, independent claims 1 and 17 are now in condition for allowance. Likewise, independent claim 11 has been amended to include the features present in claim 9, and independent claims 27, 33, and 34 have been amended to include the features present in claim 25. Thus, independent claims 1, 11, 17, 27, 33, and 34 are now in condition for allowance.

Since claims 2, 5, and 6 depend from claim 1, claim 12 depends from claim 11, claims 18, 21, and 22 depend from claim 17, and claim 28 depends from claim 27, the same distinctions between *Gazdik* and the claimed invention in claims 1, 11, 17, and 27 apply for these claims. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 2, 5, 6, 12, 18, 21, 22, and 28 have been overcome.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 17-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 33-34 were amended in the Response to Office Action filed on May 23, 2005 to include an explicit reference to a "dynamically created" installation property. By this present response, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 17-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 33-34 have been amended to delete the explicit reference to "dynamically created," as the Examiner indicated in the February 23, 2005 Office Action that the features now present in amended claim 1 are allowable without requiring

the "dynamically created" limitation added to claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 17-19, 21-24, 26-28, and 33-34 in the subsequent May 23, 2005 Response to Office Action.

Claims 13-14, 29-30, and 35 have been cancelled.

In view of the above, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11-12, 17, 18, 21, 22, 27-28, and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

## II. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Gazdik* in view of "Industrial Strength Java" by *Cassady-Dorian et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Since claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 depend from allowable independent claim 1, and claims 19, 20, 23, and 24 depend from allowable independent claim 17, the same distinctions between the combination of *Gazdik* and *Cassady-Dorian* and the claimed invention in claims 1 and 17 apply for these claims. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 19, 20, 23, and 24 have been overcome.

Claims 15-16 and 31-32 have been cancelled.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 19, 20, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has been overcome.

**III. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: September 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Cathrine K. Kinslow  
Reg. No. 51,886  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicant

CK/j1